



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/822,440	04/12/2004	Wai Ming Choi	072545-0083	1434

21125 7590 06/18/2007  
NUTTER MCCLENNEN & FISH LLP  
WORLD TRADE CENTER WEST  
155 SEAPORT BOULEVARD  
BOSTON, MA 02210-2604

EXAMINER
----------

PIZIALI, ANDREW T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1771

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

06/18/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/822,440

Applicant(s)

CHOI ET AL.

Examiner

Andrew T. Piziali

Art Unit

1771

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 07 June 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) rejected: 1-20.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.

The declaration filed on 3/7/2007 fails to show that the claimed gamma value is a direct result of step 1) adding an acidic adjusting agent and step 2) adding a neutral or basic (alkaline) adjusting agent. The declaration refers to the teachings of Example 1 of the specification, but Example 1 of the specification completely fails to mention performing step 1 and step 2. Rather, Example 1 simply examines the results of performing only step 1 compared to performing only step 2. Example 1 not only fails to teach or suggest that step 1 in combination with step 2 is necessary to obtain the claimed gamma value, Example 1 specifically teaches that the claimed gamma value is obtainable with only step 2. This Example fails to show that the nonwoven filter media taught by the applied prior does not inherently possess the claimed gamma value, because the applied prior art specifically teaches step 2.

Example A of the declaration also fails to show that the claimed gamma value is a direct result of 1) adding an acidic adjusting agent and then 2) adding a neutral or basic (alkaline) adjusting agent, because Example A does not perform step 1 or step 2. This Example fails to show that the nonwoven filter media taught by the applied prior does not inherently possess the claimed gamma value, because the applied prior art specifically teaches step 2.

In response, the applicant asserts that although an acidic adjusting agent was not "explicitly stated" it was necessarily added and a basic adjusting agent was necessarily added, because water has a pH of 6.5 to 7, not 4.3. The examiner respectfully disagrees. To arrive at a pH below 6.5 to 7, only an acidic adjusting agent is necessary. To arrive at a pH above 6.5 to 7, only a basic adjusting agent is necessary.

The applicant asserts that Dong fails to teach or suggest "adjusting" the pH, but the applicant admits that Dong discloses that the pH of the slurry ranges from about 5 to about 10. The applicant asserts that the claimed gamma value can only be obtained by forming a slurry having one pH value and then adjusting the pH to a value of about 6 to 12, preferably 7 to 10. The examiner respectfully disagrees. The current specification fails to teach or suggest that the pH value must be adjusted to obtain the claimed gamma value. Although the current specification discloses that a pH adjusting process can be used to obtain the desired end pH value of 6 to 12, preferably 7 to 10, the specification falls well short of teaching that this adjusting step is necessary. Rather, the specification teaches that the final pH value of 6 to 12, preferably 7 to 10, is responsible for the improved filtration properties (see [0024], [0030], and [0032]). The applicant has failed to show, or attempt to show, that an adjusting step is necessary to obtain the claimed gamma value.

The Patent and Trademark Office can require applicants to prove that prior art products do not necessarily or inherently possess characteristics of claimed products where claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical, or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes; burden of proof is on applicants where rejection based on inherency under 35 U.S.C. § 102 or on prima facie obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103, jointly or alternatively, and Patent and Trademark Office's inability to manufacture products or to obtain and compare prior art products evidences fairness of this rejection, *In re Best, Bolton, and Shaw*, 195 USPQ 431 (CCPA 1977).

In response to applicant's argument that Dong is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Dong is in the field of applicant's endeavor which is wet laid methods of making glass fiber mats (see column 1, lines 4-11 of Dong and [0003] of the current specification).

In response to applicant's argument that Dong does not use the glass fiber mat as filters, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.

Regarding the rejections in view of Perez, the applicant asserts that the surface area cannot merely be modified to have a specific value. The applicant asserts that the surface area "has to be achieved." Applicant's statement is noted, but regardless, Perez provides this conventional teaching showing that it is known in the filtration art to use a surface area of greater than 0.25 m<sup>2</sup>/gm, typically about 0.5 to 30 m<sup>2</sup>/g (see column 2, lines 8-21). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the surface area from about 0.5 to 30 m<sup>2</sup>/g, motivated by the expectation of successfully practicing the invention of Pierce.

In response to applicant's assertion that one skilled in the art would be unable to modify the nonwoven filter media to obtain the claimed surface area, it is well settled that unsupported arguments are no substitute for objective evidence. *In re Pearson*, 494 F.2d 1399, 1405, 181 USPQ 641, 646 (CCPA 1974).

The applicant asserts that there is no motivation to combine Pierce and Pall. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Pierce does not appear to mention varying the pH of the nonwoven glass layer during the wet laid process, but Pall discloses that it is known in the wet laid nonwoven glass art to vary the resulting pH in the range of from about 7 to about 10 to result in a nonwoven glass layer with excellent strength and enhanced particulate removal efficiency (see entire document including column 2, lines 34-46, the paragraph bridging columns 5 and 6, and column 6, lines 52-63). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to vary the pH of the nonwoven glass layer during the wet laid process to about 7 to about 10, as taught by Pierce, because the nonwoven filter media would advantageously possess excellent strength and enhanced particulate removal efficiency.

Regarding the teachings of Palls, the applicant asserts that there is no motivation to adjust the pH of the slurry of Pierce because the binder of Pierce is added after the mat is formed. The applicant appears to misinterpret the rejection. The examiner contends that it would have been obvious to utilize the wet laid process of Palls. More specifically, it would have been obvious to add the binder to the slurry before the mat is formed, as taught by Palls, as well as vary the pH from about 7 to about 10, as also taught by Palls, to form a filter media with excellent strength and enhanced particulate removal efficiency..

977 6/11/07

ANDREW PIZALI  
PRIMARY EXAMINER